

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

10 MAURICE ANTHONY BROWN,

11 Petitioner,

12 v.

13 KING COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT,

14 Respondent.

CASE NO. 2:22-CV-761-LK-DWC

ORDER GRANTING IN PART
PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR
EXTENSION

15
16 The District Court has referred this action to United States Magistrate Judge David W.
17 Christel. This matter is before the Court on plaintiff's motion for an extension of time to respond
18 to the Court's July 19, 2022 Order to Correct Deficiency (Dkt. 8, "July 19, 2022 Order"). Dkt. 9.
19 Plaintiff seeks a one-year extension to correct the deficiencies in his habeas petition, contending
20 that Covid-19 lockdowns have prevented his access to his facility's law library. *Id.*

21 In light of petitioner's difficulties accessing the law library, the Court agrees an extension
22 is appropriate. But a one-year extension would be both inappropriate and unnecessary. The
23 Court's July 19, 2022 Order identified two deficiencies, both of which should be capable of
24 ready correction by petitioner. First, petitioner submitted every other page of his original petition

1 and the Court directed him to refile the entire petition. Because petitioner is subject to the
2 Court's e-filing initiative and does not file original documents, he should still have a copy of his
3 original petition, which he may simply resubmit for filing.

4 Second, the July 19, 2022 Order observed that petitioner appeared to name an improper
5 respondent. As the Court explained, the correct respondent is usually the Superintendent of the
6 prison in which a petitioner is currently confined. Dkt. 8 at 2. Petitioner's initial filing in this
7 matter indicates he is currently confined at Airway Heights Correctional Center. Dkt. 1 at 3.
8 According to the Washington State Department of Corrections' website, the Superintendent of
9 that facility is James Key. Accordingly, petitioner need only change the name of the respondent
10 to the correct individual.

11 Neither of these corrections should require extensive time; the Court concludes that, even
12 accounting for law library issues, 45 days should be sufficient. Accordingly, the Court ORDERS
13 that the time for petitioner to respond to the Court's July 19, 2022 Order is extended to **October**
14 **3, 2022.**

15 Dated this 24th day of August, 2022.

16
17 

18 David W. Christel
19 United States Magistrate Judge
20
21
22
23
24